United Nations A/53/515

General Assembly

Distr.: General
19 October 1998

Original: English

Fifty-third session
Agenda item 9
General debate

Letter dated 16 October 1998 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Yugoslavia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

Upon the instructions of my Government, I am writing to you following the statement by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Albania, Pascall Milo, in the general debate in the General Assembly on 2 October 1998, in which he made a number of tendentious and ill-intended allegations against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

Foreign Minister Milo proceeds from the allegation that the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the Republic of Serbia conduct the policy of "ethnic cleansing" of Albanians under the guise of the struggle against so-called Albanian terrorism. The facts are different. Unfortunately, radical Albanian separatism and terrorism are a reality and the basic reason for the problems in Kosovo and Metohija. Terrorist gangs of Albanian separatists have committed an outright attack on the territorial integrity and sovereignty of the Republic of Serbia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. They committed heinous crimes, kidnapping, killing, raping and using civilians as a human shield and terrorizing and massacring citizens of all nationalities who refused to embrace their criminal goals. The legal forces of the State have taken protection and neutralization measures of a scope and intensity needed to put an end to such criminal activities. All police actions were directed against terrorists, not against the civilian population. Upon neutralization of terrorist forces, special police forces have returned to places of their permanent encampment. Today, the organs of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia invest their best efforts to alleviate the consequences of terrorist activities.

The open and completely unfounded accusations against the President of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia for so-called "ethnic cleansing" are the known constant of the official Albanian strategy. With the aim of obfuscating the support rendered to the terrorist Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA), accusations are made against the highest officials of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and involvement of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia is requested. The proclaimed aspiration of Albania to become part of Europe's democratic milieu is in sharp contrast to its support for separatism, establishment of boot camps for terrorists and their infiltration into the territory of another State; it was hoped that such a form of State activity was an anachronism in Europe.

98-31052 (E) 221098

In 1998, 1,273 terrorist acts have been committed in the territory of Kosovo and Metohija, in which 140 persons were killed, 64 of them Albanians, 37 Serbs and Montenegrins, 3 Romanies and 36 unidentified persons, while 59 persons were gravely and 56 lightly wounded. A total of 704 attacks have been carried out against members and facilities of the Ministry of the Interior of the Republic of Serbia. Ninety-four police officers were killed in a bestial way, 20 of them police reservists, while 193 were gravely and 140 lightly wounded. Two hundred forty-nine persons have been abducted by the terrorists, 162 of them Serbs and Montenegrins, 74 Albanians, 10 Romanies, 1 national of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, 1 Muslim and 1 Bulgarian. So far, 93 persons have been released, 9 have escaped and 29 have been killed. The fate of 118 is still unknown.

The call of Albania for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to intervene in Kosovo and Metohija, made purportedly in support of the "strengthening of peace" in that Serbian province, is an attempt to divert the attention of the international community from the chaotic internal situation in Albania and its responsibility for the support of terrorism and separatism. However, the agreement reached by President of Yugoslavia, Slobodan Milosevic, and United State Envoy, Richard Holbrooke, is convincing proof that the international community is committed to solving the contentious issues by peaceful and political means. It is hoped and believed that by condemning terrorism and closing terrorist boot camps in northern Albania, for instance, Albania will render its full contribution to this endeavour.

The Federal Republic of Yugoslavia is unjustly accused of being against international monitoring or against enabling full insight in what took place in Kosovo and Metohija. Yet, it is widely known that over 200 foreign diplomats, 27 international humanitarian organizations and hundreds of foreign journalists have been in Kosovo and Metohija for many months now and that delegations of many Governments and an Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) delegation have been invited. All of them have been granted full freedom of movement, personal safety and unhindered access to places they want to visit. As to the allegations about Belgrade's false manoeuvres and statements, your attention is drawn to the recently published and widely circulated "White Book", in which these allegations have been denied in a documented way and the true nature of the problems highlighted.

The allegations about "brutal violations of human rights" attributed to the legal authorities of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the Republic of Serbia are a smokescreen behind which the real culprits are being concealed. There is no conflict in areas in which there are no terrorists, regardless of the fact that Albanians outnumber other residents also in those areas (the Morava district and the towns of Gnjilane, Kosovska Mitrovica, Pristina and others). Disruption of the normal life of people in Kosovo and Metohija, be they Serbs or members of the Albanian or any other national minority, and the terror by the so-called KLA are the primary cause of all the problems and suffering besetting this province. After all, is the blame for human rights violations to be laid at the door of the Government, whose policy, it is, for instance, to allow free publication of a multitude of papers and magazines in Albanian rendering undisguised support to separatism and terrorism, or at the door of those Albanians from Kosovo and Metohija who threaten and blackmail their fellow Albanians if they dare to start a paper or magazine of different orientation or profile?

The situation in Kosovo and Metohija is improving. Peace has prevailed since the cessation of combat operations on 28 September 1998. Special anti-terrorist police units have been withdrawn (5 detachments have been withdrawn to bases of permanent location

outside the province, 5 detachments to bases of permanent location in the province). Only those units that were in their barracks in Kosovo and Metohija before March 1998 remain.

Foreign Minister Milo's invocation of a humanitarian catastrophe in Kosovo and Metohija is designed to conceal the disastrous situation in his own country. What caused humanitarian problems in this Serbian province was the abuse of civilians by terrorists who used them as a human shield and by politicians who called on them not to return home, but to stay in the woods (the call was made by none other than Ibrahim Rugova himself in the Albanian-language daily *Bujku* on 20 August 1998).

There has been a steady stream, for more than a month and a half now, of large quantities of humanitarian aid to Kosovo and Metohija, including food, medicine, clothes and building material. The Government set up 18 humanitarian centres, and they are ready to engage in cooperation with international humanitarian organizations, primarily with the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and the International Committee of the Red Cross.

The Republic of Serbia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia have great interest in ensuring normal life and work to all their citizens. This interest is the true motivation of the solidarity and humane assistance that has been rendered to all people in Kosovo and Metohija irrespective of their national affiliations.

The Parliament of the Republic of Serbia has established the Provisional Executive Council of Kosovo and Metohija of mixed ethnic composition, entrusted with the task of promoting further normalization and development in the province. Local government authorities, reflecting local ethnic composition, have been established throughout the province.

These facts are eloquent proof that the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia has complied with all the provisions of Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998) and 1199 (1998).

The most recent campaign and pressure, in which the world's most potent political and military mechanisms have been engaged, have been launched on the basis of unverified media reports about the alleged massacre of Albanian civilians in Gornje Obrinje. Judicial authorities are engaged in conducting an investigation of the matter, and those found responsible will be charged under the law. However, what is disconcerting is the silence about, and the lack of international outrage and response to, the verified massacres of Serbian civilians, including women and children, in a crematorium at Klecka (22 persons), at Glodjane (29 persons) and at Ratis (24 persons). Recently, another execution site was uncovered in the village of Dolac near the locality where the headquarters of the KLA was once located. The Federal Republic of Yugoslavia has invited international experts to verify these massacres scrupulously, and a delegation of the Helsinki Institute is due to arrive soon.

The key problem in Kosovo and Metohija is the refusal of the leaders of the Albanian political parties to engage in unconditional dialogue. The Federal Republic of Yugoslavia has extended 18 written invitations, and its representatives are still waiting for the negotiating team of the leaders of the Albanian national minority to show up at the negotiating table. After all, those leaders had left the negotiations in the first place, which accounted for the subsequent flare-up of terrorist activities and an enormous loss of human lives. They have boycotted the political process, raising always new conditions, demanding independence and refusing to condemn terrorism, blinded by their deceptive dream of Greater Albania.

Albania has done everything to support the separatists in Kosovo and Metohija. In doing so, it has violated almost every norm of international law, including the Charter of

the United Nations and the OSCE Final Act. In 1998, the border of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia was violated 110 times from the territory of Albania, and 40 members of the Army of Yugoslavia have lost their lives in these incidents. Albania is the only country in the world which has recognized the so-called Republic of Kosovo, allowed this phantom creation to open its representative office in Tirana and engaged in making "bilateral agreements" with it. Its police and armed forces are deeply involved in aiding and abetting the terrorists, while its territory is used for their recruitment, training, arming and infiltration into Kosovo and Metohija. Terrorist boot camps are located in Tropoje, Bajram Curri and Kuks, while Durres and the Tirana airport serve as ports of entry for terrorists from Europe and overseas, with full understanding and support by Albanian authorities and political parties.

Albania is the epicentre of instability that threatens to spill over to the entire region. Yet, despite the collapse of the institutions in this country, Albania cannot be exonerated for the blatant violations of the norms of international law and the basic principles of international cooperation, good-neighbourliness and non-interference in internal affairs of other countries.

I would be grateful if you would have this letter published as a document of the General Assembly under agenda item 9.

(Signed) Vladislav **Jovanovic**
Chargé d'affaires a.i.

United Nations

A/53/516

General Assembly

Distr.: General
19 October 1998

Original: English

Fifty-third session
Agenda item 94 (e)
Environment and sustainable development: implementation of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa

Implementation of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa

Report of the Secretary-General

I. Introduction

1. In its resolution 52/198 of 18 December 1997, on the implementation of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to report to it, at its fifty-third session, on the implementation of the resolution.

II. Implementation of General Assembly resolution 52/198

A. Arrangements for the headquarters of the Permanent Secretariat

2. Further to the decision of the Conference of the Parties to accept the offer of the Government of Germany to host the Convention secretariat at Bonn,[1] the Convention secretariat negotiated and signed a headquarters agreement with the Government of Germany and the Secretary-General on 18 August 1998. The Headquarters Agreement will come into force upon ratification by the German Parliament and adoption by the Conference of the Parties.

98-30965 (E) 201098

B. Global Mechanism

3. In paragraph 5 of resolution 52/198, the General Assembly invited the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), as the lead organization housing the Global Mechanism, to cooperate fully with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the World Bank. In that connection, IFAD, UNDP and the World Bank have created a Facilitation Committee, the purpose of which is to further such cooperation.

C. Additional regional implementation annex

4. In paragraph 6 of resolution 52/198, the Assembly invited the Conference of the Parties to facilitate the elaboration of an additional regional implementation annex to the Convention for the countries of the eastern and central European region to be launched at the second session of the Conference of the Parties. In paragraph 12 of the draft annotated agenda for the second session of the Conference of the Parties (ICCD/COP(2)/1 and Corr.1) it is anticipated that the Conference of the Parties may allocate to the Committee of the Whole an item on the possible elaboration of an additional regional implementation annex.

D. Action by States

5. In paragraph 13 of resolution 52/198, the General Assembly called upon all countries that were not parties to the Convention to take appropriate action for the ratification, acceptance, approval or accession to the Convention.

6. As at 18 October 1998, instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession had been deposited by the following 142 States and one regional economic integration organization: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Comoros, Cook Islands, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Niue, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Togo, Tonga, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia and Zimbabwe, and the European Community.

III. Arrangements for the second session of the Conference of the Parties

7. The General Assembly, in paragraph 19 of resolution 52/198, welcomed with appreciation the generous offer of the Government of Senegal to host the second session of the Conference of the Parties at Dakar from 30 November to 11 December 1998.

8. The Convention secretariat conducted discussions with the Government of Senegal concerning the arrangements for the second session of the Conference, and signed a host agreement with that Government on 1 September 1998.

9. The draft annotated agenda for the second session of the Conference of the Parties is contained in document ICCD/COP(2)/1 and Corr.1.

IV. Action requested of the General Assembly

10. By paragraph 17 of resolution 52/198, the General Assembly decided to include in the calendar of conferences and meetings for the biennium 1998–1999 the sessions of the conference of the Parties and its subsidiary bodies envisaged for that biennium.

11. In its decision 4/COP.1, the Conference of the Parties requested the Assembly, bearing in mind the institutional linkage of the Convention secretariat to the United Nations and the large number of States, including those which are on the list of the least developed countries, that were parties to the Convention, to decide to finance from the regular budget of the United Nations the conference-servicing costs arising from sessions of the Conference of the Parties and subsidiary bodies for the duration of the institutional linkage with the United Nations approved by the Conference of the Parties in its decision 3/COP.1, on administrative and support arrangements. In that decision, the Conference had accepted arrangements proposed by the Secretary-General for administrative support to the Convention secretariat (see A/AC.241/44 and A/AC.241/55 and Add.1-3).

12. The Secretary-General hereby conveys to the Assembly the above-mentioned request of the Conference of the Parties and invites the General Assembly to take further action thereon at its fifty-third session. The General Assembly may accordingly wish to consider at its fifty-fourth session including the sessions of the Conference of the Parties and its subsidiary bodies for 2000–2001 in the calendar of conferences and meetings for that biennium.

Notes

[1] ICCD/COP(1)/11/Add.1, decision 5/COP.1.

UNITED NATIONS **A S**

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

A/53/517
S/1998/971
19 October 1998
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: SPANISH

GENERAL ASSEMBLY
Fifty-third session
Agenda item 7
NOTIFICATION BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL UNDER ARTICLE 12, PARAGRAPH 2, OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
Fifty-third year

Letter dated 12 October 1998 from the Permanent Representative of Cuba to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to address you with regard to document A/53/357, dated 10 September 1998, circulated under item 7 of the provisional agenda of the fifty-third session of the General Assembly and entitled "Notification by the Secretary-General under Article 12, paragraph 2, of the Charter of the United Nations", which contains a summary statement on matters of which the Security Council is seized and on the stage reached in their consideration since the previous statement submitted to the General Assembly at its fifty-second session in document A/52/392.

In this connection, I have the honour to inform you that the Government of the Republic of Cuba is interested in maintaining on the list of matters of which the Security Council is seized all the items submitted by the Republic of Cuba for the attention of that principal organ of the United Nations, as included in the notification submitted to the General Assembly in document A/53/357.

I should be grateful if you would have this letter circulated as a document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Bruno RODRIGUEZ PARRILLA
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

98-31019 (E) 191098 191098

United Nations A/53/518

General Assembly

Distr.: General
19 October 1998

Original: English

Fifty-third session
Agenda item 83
United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East

Report of the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine

Note by the Secretary-General

1. The fifty-third report of the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine, covering the period from 1 September 1997 to 31 August 1998, was transmitted by the Chairman of the Commission for communication to the States Members of the United Nations in accordance with paragraph 6 of General Assembly resolution 512 (VI) of 26 January 1952 and paragraph 3 of Assembly resolution 52/57 of 10 December 1997. The text of the report of the Commission is contained in the annex to the present note.

98-31031 (E) 211098

Annex

Fifty-third report of the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine

In paragraph 3 of its resolution 52/57 of 10 December 1997, the General Assembly requested the Commission to report to the Assembly as appropriate, but no later than 1 September 1998. The Commission notes that, pursuant to Assembly resolution 51/129 of 13 December 1996, the United Nations Secretariat has engaged a contractor for the modernization of the existing records and that the project will be completed in early 1999. The Commission has authorized access by the designated representatives of the Palestine Liberation Organization to its land records in the United Nations archives for the purpose of making a scanned image of those records.

UNITED NATIONS **A S**

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

A/53/519
S/1998/973
19 October 1998

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

GENERAL ASSEMBLY
Fifty-third session
Agenda item 62
QUESTION OF CYPRUS

SECURITY COUNCIL
Fifty-third year

Letter dated 16 October 1998 from the Permanent Representative of Turkey to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to transmit herewith a letter dated 16 October 1998, addressed to you by His Excellency, Mr. Aytuğ Plümer, representative of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus.

I should be grateful if the text of the present letter and its annex would be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 62, and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Volkan VURAL
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

ANNEX

Letter dated 16 October 1998 from Mr. Aytuğ Plümer, addressed to the Secretary-General

Upon instructions from my Government, I have the honour to refer to the letters dated 16 September and 2 October 1998 addressed to you by the Greek Cypriot representative at the United Nations (A/53/399-S/1998/864 and A/53/460-S/1998/917, respectively) which contain allegations regarding cultural property in the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus.

Previous allegations regarding the so-called "plundering of the religious and cultural identity" of Northern Cyprus have been amply dealt with in our previous communications addressed to you, most recently in my letter dated 24 July 1998 (A/52/997-S/1998/697). Such unfounded Greek Cypriot charges are aimed at covering up the fact that it has been the Greek Cypriot side that has systematically tried to eradicate the Turkish Muslim heritage of Cyprus, in particular during the ethnic cleansing campaign directed against the Turkish Cypriot people between 1963 and 1974. There is ample graphic evidence of the deliberate destruction by Greek Cypriots, with the support of Greece, of historical and religious monuments in Cyprus during this period. I am enclosing herewith a list of the 103 mosques and Muslim shrines that had been the target of such actions until Turkey's legitimate intervention in Cyprus on 20 July 1974, in the wake of a coup d'état carried out by Greece and its collaborators in Cyprus with the aim of annexing the island (see appendix). The long list of devastated mosques and other places of worship testify to the extent and volume of the crimes perpetrated against the Islamic character of the island and the massive campaign of ethnic cleansing directed against the Turkish Cypriot people.

Despite the Greek Cypriot representative's rhetoric to the effect that the Greek Cypriot administration "zealously protects all places of worship belonging to all faiths in Cyprus" and the lip-service paid to the improvement of "existing international conventions for the protection of the world cultural properties", the Greek Cypriot side continues, on the one hand, to show utter contempt for what is left of the Turkish Islamic heritage in South Cyprus where Ottoman Turkish shrines are under threat of disintegration owing to total neglect and, on the other hand, systematically blocks any external financial or technical assistance to the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus for conservation purposes.

The policy of the Government of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus is to protect the cultural heritage of Northern Cyprus irrespective of its religious and cultural origins. The Department of Antiquities of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, the competent authority charged with protecting and preserving cultural sites in the Republic, has to realize its objectives with limited internal resources owing to the inhuman and illegal blockage of any international assistance to the Turkish Cypriot side by the Greek Cypriot administration. Within this context, I wish to emphasize that preservation of cultural and historical sites through reuse is carried out in accordance with international instruments governing the preservation of cultural heritage.

In view of the foregoing, it is clear that the allegations of the Greek Cypriot side on the subject of cultural heritage have no basis and are utterly unjustified. With these allegations, the Greek Cypriot side attempts to portray Cyprus as a Hellenic island with an exclusively Christian Orthodox background, in spite of the reality that Turkish Cypriots are sovereign equals and that the island has a rich Turkish Islamic heritage owing to centuries-long Turkish rule. Such efforts on the part of the Greek Cypriot side demonstrate that it is far from ready to acknowledge the existing realities on the island with a view to arriving at a partnership settlement based on sovereign equality.

I should be grateful if the text of the present letter and its appendix would be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 62, and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Aytuğ PLÜMER
Representative
Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus

APPENDIX

List of mosques and Muslim shrines destroyed or damaged by Greek Cypriots until 20 July 1974

1. Omerge Mosque
2. Bayraktar Mosque
3. Tahtakala Mosque
4. Araplar Mosque
5. Dükkanlar Önü Mosque
6. Zeytinlik Mosque
7. Aşaği Deftera Mosque
8. Aşaği Lákadamya Mosque
9. Türkeli Mosque
10. Küçük Kaymakli Mosque
11. Yilmazköy Mosque
12. Derelikköy Mosque
13. Erenköy Mosque
14. Gaziler Mosque
15. Dereli Mosque
16. Demirhan Mosque
17. Minarelikköy Mosque
18. Matyat Mosque
19. Madenlikköy Mosque
20. Katalyonda Mosque
21. Somolof Mosque
22. Akaca Mosque
23. Güzelyurt Mosque
24. Orunda Mosque
25. Peristerona Mosque
26. Denya Mosque
27. Kurtboğan Mosque
28. Bozdağ Mosque
29. Flâsu Mosque
30. Mansur Mosque
31. Dali Mosque
32. Solya Mosque

33. Eylence Mosque
34. Balikesir Mosque
35. Arpalik Mosque
36. Aybifan Mosque
37. Mamundali Mosque
38. Ceyhan Mosque
39. Yuvali Mosque
40. Ovalik Mosque
41. Çatalköy Mosque
42. Beşparmak Mosque
43. Lapta Mosque
44. Kömürcü Mosque
45. Karşiyaka Mosque
46. Tepebaşi Mosque
47. Şirinevler Mosque
48. Hz. Ömer Shrine Mosque
49. Girne Mosque
50. Aga Cafer Pasha Mosque
51. Acemzade Mecidi Mosque
52. Zahuri Mosque
53. Koraku Mosque
54. Aredyu Mosque
55. Gürpinar Mosque
56. Linu Mosque
57. Yağmuralan Mosque
58. Süleymaniye Mosque
59. Selçuklu Mosque
60. Kuzucuk Mosque
61. Çayirova Mosque
62. Mutluyaka Mosque
63. Paşaköy Mosque
64. Alaniçi (Magosa) Mosque
65. Geçitkale (Magosa) Mosque
66. Adaçay Mosque
67. Boğaztepe Mosque
68. Pinarli Mosque
69. Atlilar Mosque

70. Bahçalar (Yeni İskele) Mosque
71. Yedikonuk Mosque
72. Elmali Mosque
73. Taşlica Mosque
74. Ceylân Mosque
75. Alsandik Mosque
76. Yerovasi Mosque
77. Bağlarbaşi Mosque
78. Silifke Mosque
79. Çeliktaş (Limasol) Mosque
80. Baf Mosque
81. Eledyu Mosque
82. Amarget Mosque
83. Aktepe Mosque
84. Akkargi Mosque
85. Poli Mosque
86. Hulu Mosque
87. Girittera Mosque
88. Olukönü Mosque
89. Çinarli Mosque
90. Aşaği Baf Mosque
91. Haci Mehmet Tekke Mosque
92. Turabi Mosque and Shrine
93. Düzova (Lárnaka) Mosque
94. Akkor Mosque
95. Aksu Mosque
96. Maroni Mosque
97. Kalavason Mosque
98. Lefkara Mosque
99. Çamlibel (Lárnaka) Mosque
100. Akhisar Mosque
101. Ummu Haram Mosque
102. Aplenda Mosque
103. Alâ-tirke Mosque

UNITED NATIONS

A S

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

A/53/520
S/1998/974
19 October 1998

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

GENERAL ASSEMBLY
Fifty-third session
Agenda item 62
QUESTION OF CYPRUS

SECURITY COUNCIL
Fifty-third year

Letter dated 19 October 1998 from the Permanent Representative of Turkey to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to transmit herewith a letter dated 19 October 1998, addressed to you by His Excellency Mr. Aytuğ Plümer, Representative of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (see annex).

I should be grateful if the text of the present letter and its annex could be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 62, and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Volkan VURAL
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

ANNEX

Letter dated 19 October 1998 from Mr. Aytuğ Plümer addressed to the Secretary-General

Upon instructions from my Government, I have the honour to refer to the letters dated 30 September, 7 October and 9 October 1998 addressed to you by the Greek Cypriot representative at the United Nations, which contain allegations regarding "violations of the national airspace of the Republic and of the flight information region of Nicosia" (A/53/450-S/1998/909, A/53/476-S/1998/935 and A/53/495-S/1998/950, respectively).

As stated in our previous communications addressed to you, most recently in my letter dated 25 September 1998 (A/53/438-S/1998/896), repeated allegations by the Greek Cypriot side on so-called "airspace and FIR violations" are totally unfounded and are rejected in toto by our authorities. The present allegations do not merit a detailed reply as they are of a similar nature. I wish to emphasize, once again, that flights within the sovereign airspace and flight information region of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus take place with the full knowledge and consent of the appropriate authorities of the State. The Greek Cypriot administration in South Cyprus has no jurisdiction or right of say over flights within the national airspace of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus.

The Greek Cypriot regime in South Cyprus, while claiming to possess sovereignty and jurisdiction over the island as a whole, is precipitating further tension by pursuing a massive rearmament campaign and maintaining an offensive posture against the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. At a time when Your Excellency's Deputy Special Representative Dame Ann Hercus has started a new process of on-island contacts with both sides with a view to reducing tensions, the Greek Cypriot National Guard units together with an armada of Army, Navy and Air Force units belonging to Greece are preparing to stage provocative military manoeuvres in and around South Cyprus during the period 20 to 25 October 1998. It is reported that F-16 and A-7 warplanes from Greece will be deployed at the Paphos military air base in South Cyprus. These continuing provocations and the planned deployment of the sophisticated S-300 missiles in South Cyprus, in the context of the Joint Military Doctrine between Greece and the Greek Cypriot administration, constitute the underlying causes of tension in Cyprus. Needless to say, the current Greek Cypriot policy of militarization seriously undermines efforts towards reducing tensions and building confidence between the two sides.

On behalf of the Government of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, I wish to appeal to all parties interested in promoting a peaceful settlement in Cyprus to urge the Greek Cypriot side to cease forthwith all such provocative acts and concentrate on efforts towards creating an atmosphere which would be conducive to peace, stability and cooperation.

I should be grateful if the text of the present letter could be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 62, and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Aytuğ PLÜMER
Representative
Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus